

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ALICE WIELAND,

Case No. 3:19-CV-0724-MMD-CLB

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE NEVADA SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION,

Defendant.

Before the court is plaintiff Alice Wieland’s (“Wieland”) notice of discovery dispute (ECF No. 55). Defendant Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education (“University”) filed a response (ECF No. 56).

It appears that the notice of discovery dispute (ECF No. 55) was filed prematurely given the University's response which indicates it believed the parties are still working towards a resolution of the dispute. Therefore, the notice of dispute is denied as premature. In addition, the parties shall meet and confer within 14 days of the date of this order to resolve the dispute. If the dispute cannot be resolved, Wieland may file a new notice.

The court reminds the parties of their obligations to work through discovery disputes. “**Discovery** is supposed to proceed with **minimal involvement** of the **CourtF.D.I.C. v. Butcher, 116 F.R.D. 196, 203 (E.D. Tenn. 1986). Counsel should strive to be cooperative, practical and sensible, and should seek judicial intervention “only in extraordinary situations that implicate truly significant interests.” *Cardoza v. Bloomin’ Brands, Inc.*, 141 F.Supp.3d 1137, 1145 (D. Nev. 2015). The court notes that several**

1 discovery disputes have already been filed in this case and any further dispute notice
2 should only be filed after all efforts to resolve the issues without court involvement have
3 been completely and entirely exhausted.

4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5 DATED: April 2, 2021

6 
7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28